

pected of such a large, complex undertaking. By defining the limits of the Southwest geographically and reducing it to the characteristically arid region of popular concept, the author has excluded much that belongs to it historically (such as Monterey, California, and Los Andaes, Texas, both provincial capitals for a time). He wisely ignores his self-imposed boundaries, however, whenever they prove overly confining. His occasional misstatements of factual details may provoke the specialist but not the general reader, for they do not disturb the depth and flow of a worthwhile narrative history.

MAX L. MOORHEAD

University of Oklahoma

The Mexican War: A Compact History, 1846-1848. By CHARLES DUFOUR. New York, 1968. Hawthorne Books. Maps. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. Pp. 304. \$6.95.

Like other American wars, that with Mexico comes in for its share of retelling. Here as usual the emphasis is placed on military action, and the sources are mostly published documents, memoirs, and older secondary accounts. As an amateur historian Dufour has not attempted any new insights or interpretations. As a professional journalist he has not even told a rousing story, for his style is pedestrian and cluttered with detail.

Dufour has even less to say about the Mexicans than most writers of this genre. It begins to appear that if their side of the story is to be told, they will have to do it themselves. Nineteenth-century Mexicans—Baltontín, Roa Bárcena, Ramón Alcazar and his collaborators, Olavarria y Ferrari, and others—cleared away some of the underbrush, even though the tragic events were closer and presumably more painful to them than to the present generation. The first Mexican historian to write a modern, balanced, readable account of events in Mexico during the American invasion will have no trouble finding readers on both sides of the border.

D. M. P.

Juárez en La Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística. By MIGUEL CIVEIRA TABOADA. México, 1968. B. Costa-Amic. Notes. Pp. 100. Paper.

According to Miguel Civeira Taboada, his purpose in writing this study was to focus attention on the role of Benito Juárez as a member and supporter of the Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística. Working from hitherto unknown documents discovered in the society's archives, Taboada catalogues the various official actions of Juárez, first as governor of Oaxaca, then as president of Mexico, in which he performed the functions of a chief executive dealing with a semiofficial body. The documents consist of about six or eight official orders of Juárez concerning the society. Perhaps his most significant contribution to its success was his order that the society be reorganized in 1867 after the collapse of the Second Empire and the reestablishment of the Republic.

Such skimpy documentation would hardly merit a study of this length, had not the author also brought in a detailed and copiously documented history of the society during the four decades of Juárez' public life. Of particular interest to students of Mexican politics is the description in the manner in which Generals Mariano Arista and Juan N. Almonte used the society in their attempts to gain political power.

RAY BROUSSARD

University of Georgia

Causa de Fernando Maximiliano de Hapsburgo y sus Generales Miguel Miramón y Tomás Mejía. México, 1967. Instituto Jalisciense de Antropología e Historia. Pp. 410. Paper.

The trial and execution of Maximilian is one of the notorious events of modern Mexican history. Benito Juárez ordered that he be tried by a military court in accordance with the law of January 25, 1862, designed to punish

by death those guilty of crimes against the nation. The chief conservative generals, Tomás Mejía and Miguel Miramón, were also to be tried for traitorous collaboration with the French army. The trial was initiated at Querétaro in great haste, even before the required stamped paper had arrived. The verdict of guilty, pronounced by six junior officers, was a foregone conclusion. The three men were executed on June 19, 1867, at the Cerro de las Campanas, barely a month after Maximilian had surrendered to the triumphant Republicans. Juárez (or more likely, Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada) refused to be moved by the numerous world-wide pleas for clemency. The national integrity of Mexico had to be vindicated against those who had regarded it so lightly.

This is the most recent among several editions of the official trial record, first printed in 1867 as a part of Juan de Dios Arias' account of the operations of the Army of the North. The reviewer must ask whether this lengthy record of what was a mere legal formality can be of use to the critical historian. The answer is not immediately evident.

What does ultimately emerge, however, is an impressive defense of the accused men, as presented by several Mexican lawyers, all presumably liberal patriots. This defense rested on two principal related points. The first was that these men should not be tried in a military court for what were political crimes; moreover, the constitution forbade inflicting the death penalty in such cases. The second point was that until 1867 Mexico was engaged in a civil war, and that the accused were merely supporting one party to the conflict and not the French invader. The defense attorneys presented a vivid characterization of this civil war, and argued for instance that Mejía and Miramón could hardly be condemned for abjuring the constitution when it had reigned effectively for only three years in its first decade of life. Mexico, said the lawyers, was torn between two equally strong partisan bands, either of which

might have emerged victorious, thus calling itself patriot and the vanquished opponent traitor.

The lawyers appear to have been doing more than mouthing the sentiments of their clients. They were articulating forcefully and persuasively what may have been a more generalized private analysis of the country's crisis by both conservatives and liberals. One must be cautious not to infer too much from a lawyer's brief, but this evidence does suggest that there existed a franker appreciation of Mexican political realities than the formal writings of the era have revealed.

CHARLES A. HALE

University of Iowa

Medicine in Mexico. From Aztec Herbs to Betatrons. By GORDON SCHENDEL. Austin, 1968. University of Texas Press. The Texas Pan-American Series. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xiv, 329. \$6.50.

I do not enjoy writing or reading critical reviews of bad books, so let me be brief. Gordon Schendel could have written an informal book on the state of Mexican medicine in this century, drawing on the first hand experiences of his friends and himself. It would have been an interesting and even valuable book, for he has lived in Mexico for some years and seems to know a good bit about the healing art, as practiced in his adopted homeland by M.D. and *brujo*.

He has attempted to write a full-scale history of Mexican medicine, however, a task for which he is not prepared by training, research, or temperament. His book has no footnotes, and the bibliographical notes at the end of the chapters too often refer to Prescott's classic but outdated *Conquest of Mexico* or to such as "Early source material" and "Interviews with Mexican doctors on origins of diseases." The text is no more scholarly. Was John Cabot *really* on Catalina Island, California, in 1526 (p. 107)? Was a substantial trade *really* "carried on